$Session \ V \\ Compliance \ Through \ P^2 \ Initiatives$

Session Chairpersons:

Mr. Milt Rindahl, HQ AFMC/CEVV Dr. Joe Milligan, Labat Anderson

Lessons Learned: Compliance Through P²

Suzanne T. Thomas, P.E., Q.E.P. Rust Environment & Infrastructure 15 Brendan Way Greenville, SC 29615 Telephone: (864) 234-3016

Email: suzanne_thomas@ccmail.rustei.com

Why compliance through P2 now?

We've been doing both - and quite successfully according to the data we use to measure our progress. Measuring the data? That's one key right there - the data we measure our progress with! Is it the right data? Is the data correct? For P² progress, we measure EPA-17 or AFMC-24, ODS, hazardous waste, and others. These measurements are based on very specific waste streams and we have made a lot of progress in these areas. But there are two main problems with these measurements:

- > They are not related in any way to processes or activity levels. When our activities change, the changes but we don't see the trends.
- \triangleright They lead to P^2 programs based on hindsight because they focus on waste generation.
- > They are no longer related to today's compliance issues.

Old P² programs lead to reductions in the waste measured but, as activities changed and new compliance issues unfolded, dollars spent for compliance continued to rise. Focusing on waste quantities not related in any way to activity levels does help us with today's compliance issues, such as current quantitative permit conditions, but it doesn't help with qualitative conditions nor with forecasting future compliance issues. By shifting the focus to compliance issues first, we focus on qualifiable regulatory issues before deciding what our P² priorities are. Then we can choose the data we need to track our progress.

Today's business climate necessitates a change in how we approach environmental problems. Billions of dollars are spent each year to cleanup past improper disposal practices and old problems. The lesson learned is that pollution costs us more than money. Pollution costs us - for treatment, for transportation and disposal, and potentially for cleanup. And yet, billions of pounds of toxic materials continue to be released annually into streams, air and onto land as evidenced by the annual SARA TRI reports. These billions of pounds represent expensive raw materials, lost productivity, and inefficient processes. The loss of these materials to the environment also represents long term liabilities and intangible costs. Pollution prevention programs began as extensions of waste minimization programs that are specifically directed at reducing the generation and disposal of hazardous waste. Today, effective P² strategies focus on elimination rather than reduction; P² combines regulatory compliance with continuous improvement, materials management, and total cost accounting.

Why P^2 to solve the problem? Because we see a fundamental change at EPA - an aggressive thrust toward multi-media programs that will prevent waste as a first approach and achieve compliance in a simple yet cost-effective way. P^2 was once a voluntary exercise - now it is a business necessity. And a strong program will enable you to:

• Eliminate the need for compliance

Or, failing that,

- Lower equipment and raw material costs
- Lower treatment and disposal costs
- Lower compliance costs
- Improve management and operating costs
- Improve productivity
- Minimize liabilities and cleanup costs
- And earn the trust of your regulators and community

Where do we start?

The compliance issues need to be considered first. Figure 1 illustrates a <u>partial</u> compliance matrix for a small Air Force Base. Present and future compliance issues are listed horizontally; waste streams by process area are listed vertically. Ranking the importance of each issue is often site-specific. One set of ranking criteria could be as follows:

- 1. Compliance importance (regulatory or otherwise)
- 2. Potential cost of solution
- 3. Simplicity of solution
- 4. Potential implementation success

Qualitative numbers would have to be generated for these criteria to allow the rankings. Using these, we can prioritize processes and their waste against compliance issues. Once prioritized, the P^2 process can begin.

Opportunity assessments, options development, and feasibility analysis follow.

Case Studies

Where do we end up? Today's environmental climate necessitates the use of different tools to develop and analyze our options. Past P² opportunities were analyzed on the basis of technical feasibility, waste elimination or reduction, and cost. This presentation will look at three cases where our decisions might have been different if our tools had been modified to account for compliance upfront and to consider our data needs differently.

RUST PROJECT NO.

COMPLIANCE ITEM WASTESTREAM	SUM OF PRIORITY RANKINGS	REGULATORY									
		STATE		AIR FEDERAL		ATTAIN/	ENFORCEMENT	NPDES	RCRA		SOLID WASTE
		CONSTRUCTION PERMIT CONDITIONS	OTHER	TITLE III	TITLE V	NONATTAIN	ACTIONS		HAZARDOUS WASTE	РСВ	
CONTRACTOR OPERATED PARTS STORE	0									[
			A 20 1	1.000	1.50		10 8 20 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	1 31 17 523	123 V. S. 194		MARKAGALI DES SES S
	0		100000	24, 97, 92/75	07.487.33	GOVERNOON.	BY CONTRACTOR PRODUCTION	1048 GA	28 5 5 July 12 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	920.25	STEENSTON FOR
ENTOMOLOGY SHOP	1.377.577.	3 7 7 3 7 3 7 3 7 3	1 100	A	723 2	aria da aria a	, Kir iyaniya 💢	14,8477	3-195-95	\$100 Y 848.00	
Pesticides	3							201100000	3	1877 8 1 7 1	15.01 w/25.00 x 1 x 1
FIREFIGHTING		25 A	1 (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1	118792481 51875554447	\$200 miles			1 200 100		1	
Halon	2		2								
		5 - 19 Mary 19 1 - 1	20, 51, 20	192 13,25	77.635.75	41), 15 year og	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	200,000		1 24 1V 150	3
MEDICAL	3		 	 	 			+			
Biohazards Hazardous Waste	- 0	 	T	<u> </u>	T	1					
Radiology	0								January Commercial Com	1928 U.S. 1930	System and 455
			1 12 12 12 12 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13	964 965.1	1,55,000	1.07339		20,022,000	100000000000000000000000000000000000000	75.50 cm 200	3 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
MISCELLANEOUS Lab Packs	4	A STATE STREET	- ABS 5000	1	1	 	<u> </u>	1	2	1	2
Lab i acks	47.57	1.00		13.50	1 1 1 1 1	100 1 1980	1400113 1 75	975 CM	22 42 - 199(8),	9 5 5 7 7	gar a segui, la
PAINT SHOP	2000	a, a cometa)	2.24	10.000		119714			1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	18 (1994)	11 379 44 34.1
Air Emissions	1 2	ļ		 	1_1_		 	+	 		2
Crushed Paint Cans etc	0				+	 	+	+		 	1
etc	1 1	1	1		———	1			1		
	1								1		1.000 7500 1
		576800 2458869 58.	B ERRAGISA	. Z/hjj/2003/9/69	4 1 4 3 2 3 3	92.627.827.	. Cassistationed		1 100 1145 At 2503	1 43-000-4-40.0 2 45-12-7-7-7-8	1 (1869) (2011) 35 (2011) 36 (1869) (2013) (2013) (2013)
PHARMACY Hazardous Waste	0	100 VE zeen fige	+	1 1 10 1		1 C3 13 GG 11				1 101 101	
Materials shelf life	- 1	 	1		T	1			1		
	0										1 20 10 20 10 20 10 20 10 20 10 20 10 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20
The state of the s		7 7 8 8 7 7 8 7	A 91 A 1 A	1 1 2 11 11		- Charter		100		72.7 308	
Etc.	1	 		-	1		1	+		14	
	4								2		2
	0			-		ļ	-			_	
	3.5	+	+	 		 		+	1.5	+	2
	4	 	+	 	 	 	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	—	2		2
	6.55,850,000		· 2597(67)	34746476	M 1880 238	CX/28/08			4 8 8 8 7 6 7 8		
TRANSPORTATION AREA & WHEEL/TIRE SHOP		1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	4 1.50.50	A 1 4 4 4 5 5 5 4 4		. 15 3400 1,8		75-52K3-50	1	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 1
	4.5			+			+		2		2.5
	2.5	1	T					1	1.5		1
	2										2
	2		ir manistra	1 (4.5) (4.5)	1,2222,139	1.35,37.33,35.00	E 1 6 (1743) 2743(174)	0. 000000000	z. 1965 (88168), 1,5.	2 4-314-85	2
UTILITY OPERATIONS											
		1.1	e. 5 g 15-7	3 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	1 27 20 27 10	1 577 1 3887	. N. 190	* 30A B	S PAR STORES	r i Masifa	CONTRACTOR
	1				11_	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
	0		+	+	+	 		+		+	
	ő			 	1			 			—
	258 C8692	2 435 5 6 8 42 X S (4 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	si Mokset	1 04/7/24	F. 1879.134	K K K K K K K K K K K K K K K K K K K	i, 8202.142.147.	21 341.38.3			
	- 0	-									-
	1.5	+	+	+	+	+	+	+-	+	+	1.5
	3			1							3
	3										3
		A STANDARD CO	F. 127489	3667466	¥ 6385 - Y	C Region Chapter	2 125.00.000	4 08-55	\$* \$50 Q50 \$\$K\\\\	A. NYSORIE	S 2000 SX 12 4/66
	- 3 6	+	+	 			3 3				3
	6	1	+	+		 	3	3			+
	120,000	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	n Negates	. 91670498	2, 92 GOZ 92.	e verovease	\$ \$	6. 5.890(0)	R DESCRIPTION	30 807 Acry 3	. argedsonal com
WEAPONS SYSTEMS/MAINTENANCE SHOP	77. 1	1	W 8 (WY)	य सर्वेद्धकरीय	7 (3.0)	3 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	DINGGEZER EZER.	and Emilian C		(SANCE)	THE CHARLES AND RESERVED AND A SECOND ASSESSMENT OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPER

RUST PROJECT NO.

	STATE			AIR	. 1 - 1 1 20 sev 150 1	그렇게 하면 없는 그 하는 것	No. 1	let appy and in the second	WASTE	a series e maior de la conte de las
				AIR FEDERAL		ENFORCEMENT		RCRA WASTE		SOLID WASTE
SUM OF PRIORITY RANKINGS	CONSTRUCTION PERMIT CONDITIONS	OTHER	TITLE III	TITLE V	NONATTAIN	ACTIONS		HAZARDOUS WASTE	PCBs	
1.				1						2
2		2						1		1
2								1		1 3
	THE THE STREET	V224800	3000000	v 31558)	77792277738	Sagray William	385000000000000000000000000000000000000	Ala vervise i	755579.1e	1886880 024
3				3			-		-	2
2		2	BEAD AT 18892	41,398.15	30000000000000000000000000000000000000		/S2270	1	Section 25	5,8,8,8,9,7,78
1 2 2			(***ya.(%)).	\$\$\$\$\$\$.50	8140 F 1988	Miles Shirkey	348.35	1 2005200 1 0 50000 1	782 93 (8)	1
2 1 1								1 1	*******	1
2			Taker and Server	1	111000000000000000000000000000000000000			1.00 171, 170 8C 3	K 170-111 2801 2	2
1								1		
	RANKINGS 1 2 2 2 2 6 3 3 2 2 1 1 1 1 1	RANKINGS CONDITIONS 1 2 2 2 2 2 6 6 1 1 1 2 2 2 1 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 2 2 1 1 1 1 2 2	1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	RANKINGS CONDITIONS 1	1	1	1 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	1	1

Designate Priority As